

those wherein, as in this Government, the sovereignty of the People is recognized, questions sometimes arise, so grave in their nature that, being seriously announced, they command the whole attention of all men of common intelligence, and disdaining association with the mere party topics of the day or of the age, occupy at once exclusively the public mind. Of this character, if question ever was, is that concerning the annexation of Texas to the United States, now sprung upon the country.

When, early in the present session of Congress, the subject was casually alluded to by us, we were somewhat staggered by the remark of a contemporary—batter informed on the subject, it seems, than we then were—that the project was worthy of more serious consideration than we were disposed to give to it. But, still incredulous, no longer ago than the 26th of last month, though our suspicions were not altogether laid, we created the report of a pending negotiation for "annexation," received by way of Texas and New Orleans, as being most probably "the work of wanton mischief or interested speculation." Could we even then dream that the influences to which we then alluded, as being employed in agitating the question of annexation, had been seconded by the Executive power of this Government, in the manner and in the extent to which we are forced, by information from different quarters, reluctantly to believe.

Matters have proceeded so far, however, that it is proper that we should state to our readers what knowledge we have recently acquired on this subject, from sources to be relied upon, and endeavor to open their eyes to the dark cloud which overhangs the public peace and the national welfare if not the existence of this Union.

It is now some months ago—probably not long after the retirement of Mr. Webster from the Department of State—that an overture was made, by this Government, through the Secretary of State, inquiring from the Executive of Texas (Gen. Houston) a proposition for the annexation of Texas to the United States. This overture was, at first, if we understand rightly, rather coolly received by the Chief of the young Republic. But since the meeting of Congress, the Government of Texas having been again approached—we will not say importuned, though circumstances almost justify the use of that phrase—by the Executive of the United States, Gen. Houston did at length consent to negotiate on the subject. The terms of an arrangement between the high contracting parties are already arranged; and if not already done, they are to be reduced forthwith to the form of a Treaty, through the agency of a special Minister from Texas, (Mr. Henderson,) who is already on his way to this city for the purpose, if, before this paper goes to press, he have not already arrived.

So far as the President of the United States and the President of Texas are concerned, the Treaty is all but made.

This information has, we confess, filled our minds with humiliation and apprehension. Humiliation at the unauthorized and almost clandestine manner in which, after having heretofore solemnly rejected, for unsavory reasons, a proposition for annexation, when sought by the Government of Texas, our own Government has gone a wooing to that of Texas and solicited its favors; and apprehension of the consequences of the consummation of the Treaty, which the President at least has been made to believe will be promptly ratified by a constitutional majority of the Senate of the United States.

The sudden occurrence of this question, we have already intimated, is one of those occasions of engrossing interest, which, like that of a foreign invasion, or a rebellion at home—a pestilence, or an earthquake—ought to suspend for a time all mere party differences and contentions. It is a question of peace or war, of self-preservation, of national existence, in comparison with which the ordinary topics of party controversy dwindle into absolute insignificance.

While speaking thus, we know and feel that we are expressing sentiments not in accord with those of some of our political friends. We sincerely regret it, on our account and on theirs. But when, in our opinion, a great danger impends, we must not be deterred by such considerations from sounding the alarm, and calling upon public opinion to make itself heard at the Capitol in tones which can neither be misunderstood nor disregarded.

The annexation of Texas to this Union, under present circumstances, is opposed, in our judgment, by a host of considerations, of which it will not be possible for us to-day more than to enumerate the chief. Before doing which, however, we wish to state that there is no one who more sincerely desires the welfare and prosperity of the people who compose the population of Texas than we do. We would contribute to it in any way not incompatible with the honor and the interest of the great commonwealth within which our lot is cast. Desiring to see the Republic of Texas independent in fact as it is in name, we would exert the power of this Government to any extent which would not commit the fame and the peace of this country towards that end. We would employ all the means of counsel, persuasion, and co-operation with other nations in friendly offices, to secure to

her that durable peace and tranquility, which alone are wanting to her growth into a populous, productive, and wealthy State among the nations of the earth.

Our first objection to the annexation of Texas is, that it cannot be accomplished without involving the country in war; too great a price to pay for any territorial acquisition whatever, which the National honor does not demand.

Our second objection is, that, far from demanding this acquisition, the National honor forbids it. So long as war continues between Mexico and Texas, and a solemn Treaty of Peace and Amity exists between us and Mexico, we cannot, without violating the sacred faith of treaties, undertake to possess ourselves of the Territory, to which Mexico still maintains her right. We have, it is true, acknowledged the independence of Texas, as we had a right to do for certain international purposes; but that recognition did not extinguish, or in any manner affect the rights of Mexico upon Texas. The obligations of our Treaty with Mexico remain untouched; and Mexico would have the same right to possess herself (if she could) of any State of this Union as the Government of the United States has to possess itself of Texas.

Our third great objection (which would be conclusive without the preceding) is that the Territory of the United States is already large enough. It is indefinitely more important that we should people and improve what we have, than grasp after more, especially when its acquisition would be inevitably attended with discord and dissatisfaction. It is far more important to the happiness of the people of the United States that they should enjoy in peace, contentment and harmony, what they already have, than that they should place all those blessings at hazard by this new experiment.

Our fourth objection is, that, if the "annexation" of Texas were in other respects desirable, one entire third of this Union, at least, forbids the same, doubts the constitutional right to establish the connexion, and declares its determination to resist it. The proposition to annex or incorporate a Foreign Nation in this Union, moreover, is entirely new, and the authority to do it is solemnly questioned. This objection would have much less force had we, in this case, instead of recognizing the independence of Texas, negotiated with Mexico, with or without the consent of the people of Texas, for the acquisition of that territory. We would not, merely to acquire more land, (of which we have already more than we want,) jeopard the existence of the Union, which ought to be dearer to the heart of every American citizen than any consideration extraneous to it.

Fifthly, we dread the beginning by the United States of a system of acquisition of foreign territory by conquest, [which as things stand, the annexation of Texas would effectively be,] or even by purchase. Once begin it, and where will it end? Shall we ever have territory enough for ambition, though we have enough for our want?

With these brief hints we willingly relieve our readers from our own discourse, to ask their attention to a view of the ground heretofore occupied by our Government on this subject, from which it is proposed now to depart. We have the more pleasure in doing this, because it affords us the opportunity of giving due credit to the last Administration for its conduct in regard to this matter, and particularly of doing justice to the patriotism and nice sense of honor of the Secretary of State [now no more] under that Administration, as displayed, in reference to this question, in the extracts which we shall make.

On the 4th of August, 1837, a few months after the accession of Mr. Van Buren to the Presidency, a correspondence was opened with Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State, by Gen. Memucan Hunt, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Texas, in which the annexation of Texas was formally proposed to this Government, and supported by a train of argument quite as cogent as any that can now be applied to sustain such an application. The offer was declined, as our readers know, by the President; and this decision was communicated by Mr. Forsyth to the Texian Minister in a letter under date of August 25th, than the terms of which nothing can be more decisive or explicit. It is from this letter that we make the following extracts for the information of such of our readers as have never seen or have forgotten this correspondence.

"The question of the annexation of a foreign independent State to the United States has never before been presented to this Government. Since the adoption of their Constitution two large additions have been made to the domain originally claimed by the United States. In acquiring them this Government was not actuated by a mere thirst for away over a broader space. Paramount interests of many members of the Confederacy, and the permanent well-being of all, imperatively urged upon this Government the necessity of an extension of its jurisdiction over Louisiana and Florida. A peace, however, was our cherished policy, never to be departed from unless honor should be periled by adhering to it, we patiently endured for a time serious inconveniences and privations, and sought a transfer of those regions by negotiations and not by conquest.

"The issue of those negotiations was a

conditional cession of these countries to the United States. The circumstance, however, of their being colonial possessions of France and Spain, and therefore dependent on the metropolitan Governments, renders those transactions materially different from that which would be the question of the annexation of Texas. The latter is a State with an independent Government, acknowledged as such by the United States, and claiming a territory beyond, though bordering on, the region ceded by France, in the Treaty of the 30th of April, 1803. Whether the Constitution of the United States contemplated the annexation of such a State, and if so, in what manner that object is to be effected, are questions, in the opinion of the President, it would be inexpedient, under existing circumstances, to agitate.

"So long as Texas shall remain at war, while the United States are at peace with her adversary, the proposition of the Texian Minister Plenipotentiary necessarily involves the question of war with that adversary. The United States are bound to Mexico by a treaty of amity and commerce, which will be scrupulously observed on their part so long as it can be reasonably hoped that Mexico will perform her duties and respect our rights under it. The United States might justly be suspected of a disregard of the friendly purposes of the compact if the overture of General Hunt were to be even reserved for future consideration, as this would imply a disposition on our part to espouse the quarrel of Texas with Mexico—a disposition wholly at variance with the spirit of the treaty, with the uniform policy and the obvious welfare of the United States.

"The inducements mentioned by Gen. Hunt, for the United States to annex Texas to their territory, are duly appreciated; but, powerful and weighty as they certainly are, they are light when opposed in the scale of reason to treaty obligations and respect for that integrity of character by which the United States have sought to distinguish themselves since the establishment of their right to claim a place in the great family of nations. It is presumed, however, that the motives by which Texas has been governed in making this overture will have equal force in impelling her to preserve, as an independent Power, the most liberal commercial relations with the United States. Such a disposition will be cheerfully met in a corresponding spirit by this Government. If the answer which the undersigned has been directed to give to the proposition of Gen. Hunt should unfortunately work such a change in the sentiments of that Government as to induce an attempt to extend commercial relations elsewhere, upon terms prejudicial to the United States, this Government will be consoled by a consciousness of the rectitude of its intention, and a certainty that, altho' the hazard of transient losses may be incurred by a rigid adherence to just principles, no lasting prosperity can be secured when they are disregarded."

\*The entire correspondence may be found in the Appendix to the 14th volume of the Register of Debates.

**TWENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.**  
Correspondence of the Baltimore American.  
WASHINGTON, March 11th, 1844.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**  
Mr. Saunders of N. C., called the attention of the House to some resolution in relation to the Court of Columbus, O., which has been improperly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and under circumstances which were considered objectionable.

The resolution complained of was adopted on Saturday, and instructed the Judiciary Committee to bring in a Bill to remove the Court altogether to Columbus instead of holding a part of the term at Cincinnati.

**THE TARIFF.**  
Mr. Boyd of Ky. moved that 20,000 extra copies of the Report and Bill of the Committee on Ways and Means be printed for the use of the House.

Anticipating objections, or a motion to print the report of the minority, Mr. Boyd moved the Previous Question, which cut off any amendment. The Previous Question was then seconded, 87 to 45.

The resolution was then adopted—Ayes 109, noes 51.

**THE TARIFF AGAIN.**  
Mr. Tilden of Ohio moved a resolution proposing that as many copies of the Minority Report upon the Tariff be printed as of the Minority Report, and that the two Reports be printed and circulated together.

Objections were heard from the Democratic members.

Mr. Fisk of New York moved to lay the resolution upon the table, and called for the yeas and nays which were ordered. By this means the majority were compelled to show their hands, and voted to lay the resolution upon the table, yeas 93, nays 70.

**THE TARIFF AGAIN.**  
A resolution was offered by Mr. Moore of Ohio that the House would proceed on the 21st day of the present month to discuss the Tariff Bill reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, and continue to act upon the same from day to day until disposed of.

The Van Buren Convention meets at Baltimore.)

A scene of confusion followed, in the midst of which the House adjourned by a vote of 84 to 72, at a quarter before 4 o'clock.

## THE TIMES.

For President.

Henry Clay,  
Of Kentucky.

For Governor of Ohio.

Mordecai Bartley

Of Richland County.

Senatorial Electors.

THOMAS CORWIN, of Warren;

PETER HITCHCOCK, of Geauga,

Dist. Congressional Electors.

1—BELLAMY STORER, of Hamilton;

2—WILLIAM BERR, of Butler;

3—ABRAHAM HARLAN, of Greene;

4—SAMUEL MASON, of Clark;

5—DAVID J. COREY, of Henry;

6—JOSIAH SCOTT, of Crawford;

7—READER W. CLARK, of Clermont;

8—DAVID ADAMS, of Ross;

9—JOSEPH OLDS, of Pickaway;

10—DANIEL S. NORTON, of Knox;

11—WASH. W. CONKLIN, of Marion;

12—SAMUEL R. HOLCOMB, of Gallia;

13—HARLOW CHAPIN, of Washington;

14—JOHN CROOKS, of Guernsey;

15—SAMUEL W. BOSTWICK, of Harrison;

16—WILLIAM R. SAPP, of Holmes;

17—JOHN W. GILL, of Jefferson;

18—CYRUS SPINK, of Wayne;

19—JOHN H. BALDWIN, of Trumbull;

20—WILLIAM L. PERKINS, of Lake;

21—JOHN FULLER, of Erie.

**POMEROY:**

Wednesday, March 27th, 1844.

**Ohio University.**

V. B. Horton, Joseph Olds, James M. Brown, and Judge Keith were appointed by the Legislature members of the Board of Trustees of the Ohio University. As far as we know, we do not hesitate to pronounce them men of high standing and ability.

**GRAHAM'S MAGAZINE FOR APRIL**, has been received. It is got up in its usual neat and excellent style. The enterprising proprietor of this work, has engaged competent artists to prepare a series of exquisite views of the "BATTLE-GROUND OF AMERICA." The first will appear in the May number, and the proprietor has pledged himself that they shall be the most highly finished engravings that have ever been done in the United States.

**Embellishments—The Orphan Girl—The Rector's Daughter—Portrait of N. P. Willis.**

**Annexation of Texas.**

In to-day's paper will be found some important news in relation to the annexation of Texas. We cannot be much surprised at any treachery committed by John Tyler after his baseness to the Whig party—and in this instance we cannot be much surprised at the treachery of a man of such impure morals when we recollect that he has large possessions in Texas, and if she is admitted into the Union, their value will be doubled. The Cincinnati Gazette closes a long article on this subject in this manner:

But if these objections were held light, if there be any man in free or slave State who should say "they are not valid," there is yet one other left which the common heart of this nation would avow and feel while it had one pulsation left, and that is, that the annexation of Texas can never be accomplished except against every interest of humanity. The net itself would tend to spread and continue Slavery through all time. It would tread into the very dust the principles of our declaration of independence and erect upon their ruin a slave power over free men which would rule them with the waywardness and tyranny of an insolent and a lordly pride. And who, willing to concede, what of right belongs to the Slave States, who, with night of the principles of freedom burning in his bosom, can submit to an act which shall open the door wide for the renewal of the inhuman and accursed slave traffic? Who, standing on a soil where there are no fetters to bind mind or body, can consent to have an extended territory added to it in which the lash of the task-master shall drive men as brutes to dig and delve and do whatever he may bid? Who, looking up to Heaven, and acknowledging the Being enthroned there as the common Father of all, and upon Earth, and beholding around him the common brotherhood which He has ordained among men, dare by word or thought or act encourage, sympathize with, uphold, or defend a measure so foul in conception, so branded with wrong to man, so defiant to God? There are none such, we

trust, in the Free States of this Republic, or if there be, let them cease to claim their heritage, or to assert the privileges they enjoy—for they are the abject defenders of slavery, and fit only to be slaves themselves! The voice of Ohio and Indiana—the voice of the more enlightened Slave States—the voice certainly of all the Free States, will be—**we are united against this astounding abuse of power—this cursed scheme of the Spoiler and the Speculator.**

Friends of the Country and of Humanity! Arise. The occasion requires action: it calls for the exertions of your wisest—fullest—energy. Arouse! The foul injustice attempted—the clandestine manner in which the President of these United States and the President of Texas have conspired against the peace, honor, & welfare of the Nation—the danger threatened to the integrity and stability of the Union, and the lawless disregard manifested of the rights of humanity and of the People of the Free States,—**DEMAND that their voice should be heard in thunder-tones at the Capitol, rebuking there, with a master's authority, this fell spirit of ruin.**

**Mr. Webster—The Texas Question.**

Mr. Webster has written a letter on the annexation question, to sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass. The paper containing the letter has not reached us, and we can now only give the following extract from it which will be read with interest. Mr. W. says:

"I am certainly of opinion, with Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, Mr. J. Q. Adams, and other eminent men, that the CONSTITUTION NEVER CONTEMPLATED THE ADMISSION OF NEW STATES, FORMED OUT OF THE TERRITORIES OF FOREIGN NATIONS; and while I admit, that what has been done in regard to Louisiana and Florida must now be considered as legally done, yet I do not admit the propriety of proceeding farther, and admitting not a territory, ceded by a foreign nation, but a foreign nation itself, with all its obligations and treaties, its laws and its institutions, into the number of the States which compose the Union."

The letter concludes as follows:

"The broad question proposed by you, of the probable general influence of the annexation of Texas upon American liberty and industry, the continuance of our Union, and the universal cause of knowledge, virtue, liberty and happiness, is a question full of intense interest, and which suggests thoughts and reflections well worthy to engage the deepest attention of intelligent minds. It is not to be doubted that the continuance of the American Union, and its prosperity and success, under its present form of government, is a matter of high moment to all mankind. It is one of the most cherished hopes and reliances of that universal cause of which you speak; the cause of human knowledge, virtue, liberty and happiness. And he is a bolder reasoner than I am, who has satisfied himself that this government may be extended indefinitely, either to the North or South, without endangering its stability and its duration. It is true that under the beneficent operation of the principle of maintaining local governments for local purposes, and confiding general interests to a general government, the ends of political society are capable of being fulfilled, by the same free and popular system, and the same administration, over a large portion of the earth. This is the result of our experience; but our experience is the only instance of such a result. A monarchical and arbitrary government may extend itself to the full limit of its military means. Under such a government, society is kept together by pressure from above; by the weight of the government itself, and the strength of its arm. But how obvious is it that, in free, elective systems, the political society exists and coheres, and must exist and cohere, not by superincumbent pressure on its several parts, but by the internal and mutual attraction of those parts; by the assimilation of interests and feelings; by a sense of common country, common political family, common character, fortune and destiny. Not only the organization of such systems, but also their continuance by means of periodical popular elections, necessarily requires intercourse, mutual conference, and understanding, and a general acquaintance among those who are to unite in such elections. When individuals are to be selected for high situations in government, and to exercise an influence over the happiness of all, it would seem indispensable, that a general, if not a universal confidence should be inspired, by knowledge of their character, their virtues and patriotism. It certainly may be very well questioned, with how much of mutual intelligence, and how much of a spirit of conciliation and harmony, those who live on the St. Lawrence and the St. John, might be expected, ordinarily, to unite in the choice of a President, with the inhabitants of the Banks of the Rio Grande del Norte, and the Colorado.

"It is evident, at least, that there must be some boundary or some limits to a Republic which is to have a common centre. Free and ardent speculations may lead to the indulgence of an idea that such a Republic may be extended over a whole hemisphere. On the other hand, minds less sanguine, or more chastened by the examples of history, may fear that extension often produces weakness, rather than strength; and that political attraction, and other attractions, is less and less